

THE  
EXCEPTIONS  
Of Mr. EDWARDS, in his  
**Causes of Atheism.**

*Against the Reasonableness of Christianity,  
as deliver'd in the Scriptures,*

EXAMIN'D;

And found Unreasonable, Unscriptural,  
and Injurious.

A L S O

It's clearly proved by many Testimonies of Holy Scripture, That the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the only God and Father of Christians.

---

London, Printed in the Year MDCXCV.

# EXCERPTS

OF THE

## LETTERS OF THE

APOSTLES TO THE ROMANS

AND THE

EPHESIANS

IT IS CLEARLY PROVED THAT THE  
GOSPEL OF THE SON OF GOD  
AND FATHER OF OUR LORD JESUS  
CHRIST IS THE ONLY WAY  
OF SALVATION

LONDON, PRINTED IN THE YEAR 1800

*To the Author of the Reasonableness of Christianity as delivered in the Scriptures.*

SIR,

**I**N reading your Book of that Title, I readily perceived your Design, intimated in your Preface, to be therein most industriously and piously pursued: So that you have, with full Evidence of Scripture and Reason, shewed, against the manifold obscure and tedious Systems, that the Fundamentals of Christian Faith, necessary to constitute a Man a true Member of Christ's Church, are all comprehended or implied in this plain Proposition, That Jesus is the Messiah: Whereby you have happily provided for the Quiet and Satisfaction of the Minds of the honest Multitude or Bulk of Mankind, floating in Doubts and Fears, because either they cannot understand, or can find no clear Evidence in Holy Scripture, of those intricate Points requir'd to be explicitly believ'd upon pain of eternal Damnation. You have also argued clearly the Reasonableness and Usefulness of the Christian Revelation against Atheists and Deists. These things consider'd, 'twas no marvel, that the Systematical Men, who gain both their Honour and Profit by the Obscurity and Multitude of their Fundamental Articles, should raise an Outcry against you, like that of the Ephesians magnifying their DIANA. They have more cause for it than Demetrius had. But that they should traduce your Work as tending to Atheism or Deism, is as strange from Reason, as many of their Articles are from Scripture. And that Mr. Edwards has done it, and forc'd it in among his Tendencies to Atheism, is, I think, to be imputed to the Co-incidence of your Book's being publish'd, and striking strongly upon his inventive Faculty, just when it was in hot pursuit of the Causes of Atheism, rather than to any the least Colour or Inclination

*clination that way, which Mr. Edwards can spy in it in his cool Thoughts: For I am much perswaded on the contrary, that there is no Atheist or Deist in England, but, if he were ask'd the Question, would tell Mr. Edwards, that their obscure and contradictory Fundamentals were one Cause or Inducement to his casting off and disbelief of Christianity.*

*In this Mind I have undertaken to vindicate your Doctrine from the Exceptions of Mr. Edwards against it. But whether I have done it as it ought to have been done, I cannot be a competent Judg. If I have mistaken your Sense, or us'd weak Reasonings in your Defence, I crave your Pardon: But my Design in this Writing was not to please you, (whom I know not) nor any Man whatsoever, but only to honour the One God, and vindicate his most useful Truths. I am,*

S I R,

*Your very humble Servant.*

---

  

Mr.



## Mr. EDWARDS'S Exceptions against the Reasonableness of Christianity, examined, &c.

**I**T seems to me, that Mr. Edwards, printing his *Causes of Atheism*, whilst the *Reasonableness of Christianity* was newly publish'd, was put upon it by his Bookseller, to add some Exceptions against that Treatise so much noted for its Heterodoxy; that so the Sale of his own Tract might be the more promoted: whence it comes to pass, that his Notes being writ in haste, are not so well digested as might be expected from a Person of his Learning and Ingenuity. In pag. 104. he takes notice of A PLAUSIBLE CONCEIT, which hath been growing up a considerable Time, &c. but tells not his Reader what that Conceit was, till he hath charged it upon a very Learned and famous Author, whom he is pleased to call a *wavering Prelate*, and another of the same Order, and a Third of a lower Degree; but more particularly, *fully and distinctly*, upon the late Publisher of *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. Here at length in his next Page, he tells us, That this Author gives IT us over and over again, in these formal

words, viz. *That nothing is required to be believed by any Christian Man but this, THAT JESUS IS THE MESSIAH.* I think if he had not been in haste, he would have cited at least two or three of those Pages, wherein we might find those formal Words, but he has not one, and I do not remember where they are to be found; for I am almost in as much haste as Mr. Edwards, and will not seek for them. It's true, he says, *That all that was to be believed for Justification, or to make a Man a Christian, by him that did already believe in, and worship one true God, maker of Heaven and Earth, was no more than this single Proposition, That Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ or the Messiah.* But then he takes to be included in this Proposition, 1. All synonymous Expressions, such as, the Son of God; The King of Israel; The sent of God; He that should come; He of whom Moses and the Prophets did write; The Teacher come from God, &c. 2. All such Expressions as shew the manner of his being the Christ, Messiah, or Son

Son of God, such as his being conceived by the Holy Ghost and Power of the most High; his being anointed with the Holy Ghost and Power; his being sanctified and sent into the World; his being raised from the Dead, and exalted to be a Prince and Saviour after the time he was so, &c. 3. Such Expressions as import the great Benefits of his being the Messiah; as having the Words of Eternal Life; his having Power from the Father to remit Sins, to raise the Dead, to judge the World; to give eternal Life; to send the H. Spirit upon the Apostles whereby they might work Miracles, and preach the Light of Life to Jews and Gentiles, and the like. For all those Quotations of Scripture which the Author (as Mr. Edwards observes) has amassed together out of the Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles, which take up about three quarters of his Book, for the proof of his Proposition, are indeed expository of the meaning of that Proposition, and are included in it. Not that it was necessary that every one, who believed the Proposition, should understand and have an *explicite* Faith of all those particulars: for neither the Believers during the Life of Christ, nor the Apostles themselves understood many of them, no nor presently after his Death and Resurrection; for they had still divers erroneous Opinions concerning the Nature of his

Kingdom, and the preaching to the Gentiles, and other things. And in the beginning of Christ's preaching, though Philip believ'd that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of God, the King of Israel; yet he seems to be ignorant of his being born of a Virgin, for he calls him the Son of Joseph, John 1. 45. But as he that believes that William the 3<sup>d</sup> is the true King of England, &c. believes enough to make him a good Subject, though he understands not all the grounds of his Title, much less all his Power and Prerogatives that belong to him as King: So he that believes upon good Grounds that Jesus is the Messiah, and understands so much of this Proposition as makes him, or may make him a good Subject of Christ's Kingdom, though he be ignorant of many things included in that Proposition, he has all the Faith necessary to Salvation, as our Author has abundantly proved.

But Mr. Edwards says, *This Gentleman forgot, or rather wilfully omitted a plain and obvious Passage, in one of the Evangelists, GO TEACH ALL NATIONS, &c. Mat. 28. 19. From which it is plain (says he) that all that are adult Members of the Christian Church, must be Taught as well as Baptiz'd into the Faith of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and then they must believe it: and consequently more is required to be believed by Christian Men, than that Jesus is the Messiah.*

He

He infers from this, *You see it is part of the Evangelical Faith, and such as is necessary, absolutely necessary to make one a Member of the Christian Church, to believe a TRINITY in Unity in the God-head; or, in plainer Terms, that though God is one as to his Essence and Nature, yet there are three Persons in that Divine Essence, and that these three are really the one God.* I must confess, that if Mr. Edwards's reasoning be good, the Author is totally confuted, three quarters of his Book at least are writ in vain, and the old Systems must stand good; and the *Bulk of Mankind* will certainly be damned, or it will be a wonder if any of them be saved. But give me leave to tell him I do not see, what he says we do see: that Text will well enough consist with our Author's Proposition. For I would ask him, whether the Apostles follow'd this Commission or not: If they obey'd it, then in Baptizing in the Name of *Jesus the Messiah*, and exhorting those to whom they preached, to be baptiz'd in the Name of the *Messiah*, after their preaching the *Messiah* to them, they did in effect baptize in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, otherwise they did not pursue their Commission; for we never find them baptizing in those express Terms, but always in the Name of *Jesus the Messiah*, or the Lord *Jesus*, or the Lord, and the like. So that Mr. Edwards must either

charge the Holy Apostles with Ignorance of, or Disobedience to their Lord's Command, or acknowledge that they did really baptize in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, when they did but expressly baptize in the Name of the Son or *Messiah*; forasmuch as all that were so baptiz'd, did believe in the Father of that Son of God, as implied in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, as the Anointing of the Son, and which also was given to those that were so baptiz'd. But as for his Inference, viz. That it's absolutely necessary to believe a Trinity in Unity in the God-head; or that God is one as to his Essence and Nature, yet there are three Persons in that Divine Essence, and that these three Persons are really the one God: This will condemn not only the Unitarians, and the *Bulk of Mankind*, but the greater part of Trinitarians, the Learned as well as the Vulgar. For all the real Trinitarians do not believe one Essence, but three Numerical Essences. Here Dr. Sherlock, Dr. Cudworth, the Bishop of Gl. the late Arch-bishop, Mr. H-m, and all that hold as the Council of *Nice* did, with that Council it self, and the whole Church (except some Hereticks) for many Centuries, are by Mr. Edwards expung'd out of the Catalogue of Christian Believers, and consequently condemn'd to the horrible Portion of Infidels or Hereticks. The Mystery

stery-men, or *Ignoramus Trinitarians*, they are condemn'd too; for they admit not any Explication, and therefore not Mr. Edwards's. There remains only Dr. South, and Dr. Wallis, and the Philosopher Hobbs, who (Mr. Edwards says) is the great Master and Lawgiver of the profess'd Atheists, pag. 129. and that Party which have the absolutely necessary Faith of three Persons in one Essence. But if you ask these Men what they mean by three Persons: Do they mean according to the common sense of Mankind, and especially of the English Nation, three singular intellectual Beings? No, by no means, that is Fritheism, they mean three *Modes* in the one God, which may be resembled to three *Postures* in one Man; or three external Relations, as Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier; as one Man may be three Persons, a Husband, a Father and a Master. This is that Opinion of Faith, which the Antients made Heresy, and Sabellius the Head of it. Thus it is absolutely necessary to make a Man a Christian, that he be a Sabellian Heretick. But perhaps Mr. Edwards may be of Mr. H--w's Mind, for he says, *These three Persons are really the one God*; but then, no one of them singly is so; but every one a *Third of God*: If so, Mr. Edwards is indeed a Unitarian, for he gives us one God only; but then he is no Trinitarian, for he has put down the Father him-

self from being God singly, and so the Son and Holy Ghost.

As to what he says of being Baptized into the Faith and Worship of none but the only true God, that has been answer'd a hundred times. He cannot look into any of the Unitarian Books, but he will find a sufficient Answer to that Inference. Were the Israelites baptiz'd into the Worship of Moses? but they were baptiz'd into Moses, 1 Cor. 10. 2. Or when the Apostle Paul supposes he might have baptiz'd in his own Name; Did he mean that he should have baptiz'd into the Worship of himself as the most high God?

Then Mr. Edwards minds his Reader, that the Author had left out also that famous Testimony in Joh. 1. 1. *In the beginning was the Word [Jesus Christ] and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Whence (saith he) we are obliged to yield assent to this Article, *That Christ the Word is God.* Here Mr. Edwards must mean that this is a Fundamental Article, and necessary to Salvation; otherwise he says nothing against his Author, who has prevented his urging any other Text, not containing a Fundamental, in his Answer to the Objection from the Epistles and other Scriptures. For (saith he) pag. 299. *They are Objects of Faith--- They are Truths, whereof none that is once known to be such may be disbelieved. But yet a great many of them, every one does,*

does, and must confess a Man may be ignorant of; nay disbelieve, without Danger to his Salvation: As is evident in those who allowing the Authority, differ in the Interpretation and Meaning of several Texts.—Unless Divine Revelation can mean contrary to it self. The whole Paragraph ought to be read, which I have abridged. And if this Text of John 1. 1. be not one of those, that by reason of its difficulty and variety of Senses, may not be disbelieve'd in Mr. Edwards's Sense, then I will be bold to say, There's no such Text in the whole Bible. To it I say, 1. He dares not trust his Reader with the clear Text, but thrusts in his own Sense, *In the beginning was the Word* (Jesus Christ :) and then 2. Makes his Fundamental Article not from the Text, but from what he has inserted into the Text thus, *Christ the Word is God*. But will Mr. Edw. stick to that? Is he of Socinus's Mind, that by the Word is meant the Man Jesus Christ, born of the Blessed Virgin, and anointed with the Holy Ghost? I think he is not. Or does he mean that Christ was the First-born of every Creature, as he is called, Col. 1. 14. *The beginning of the Creation of God*, Rev. 3. 14. By whom God made the Worlds, and is therefore a God? I think Mr. Edw. might be call'd an Arian, if that were his Sense. What then does he mean? He does not mean that either the Body or Soul, or both united to constitute a

Man, or the Anointing of the Holy Ghost added to that Man, was the Word; though by reason of those he had the Name of Jesus, and by reason of this he had the Name of Christ. He means by the Word, a second Person or Mode of God. Now how fairly he calls this second Person a Mode of God, *Jesus Christ*, when it was neither Jesus nor Christ, nor any part of him, let his Reader judg. *In the beginning was the Word*] that is, (according to him) before the Beginning, and therefore from Eternity, God in a second Mode or Person did exist: *and the Word was with God*] i. e. God in the second Mode was present with God, even himself in the first Mode or Person: *and the Word was God*] i. e. God in his second Mode was himself; or otherwise, was the Father himself and the Holy Ghost; for he tells us before, that the three Persons [or Modes] are really the one God: but if the Word is really the one God, as Mr. Edw. understands the Term God in this Text, then the Word is the three Persons, or else he is not really the one God, which the three Persons only are. Now if this be a clear Text to build an Article necessary to Salvation, and the Worship of another Almighty and only wise Person upon, besides the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; let all that have any reverence for God or his Gospel judg! Besides, can he alledge one



Text out of all the Old Testament, or out of the three former Gospels, where ever by the *WORD* or *Logos* (as they love to speak) is meant any such preexistent eternal Person? If there be none such, it seems to be no little Defect in the Holy Scriptures, that the World should be 4000 Years old, before any part of it heard any thing of a second personal God, equal to the First, and who had therefore as much Right to be known and worshipped as the First: Nay, and that that Person, *the Word*, should have no mention made of him in the Gospels or Sermons of Christ or the Apostles till above threescore Years after the Ascension; for it for it was so long (as Ecclesiastical Historians tell us) before the Gospel of the Apostle *John* was written, all the Churches and Believers we read of in Scripture, having been gathered and converted before.

Next Mr. *Edw.* tells us (p. 107.) *there is added in verse 14. another indispensable point of Faith, viz. That the Word was made Flesh, i. e. That God was incarnate, the same with 1 Tim. 3. 16. God manifest in the Flesh.*

One would have expected that Mr. *Edw.* undertaking in short to confute a Proposition, that the Author had spent *three quarters of his Book* (which consists of 300 Pages) in proving; and for which he had alledg'd perhaps an hundred clear Texts of Holy Scrip-

ture, should have produc'd some clear Texts against him, and not such as need Explanations; and when he has explain'd them, leaves them far more difficult than before. We have spoken already of the *Word* that was said to be God in the first verse of that Chapter; and now in the 14<sup>th</sup> the *Word* must signify God: but, 1. Are not the same Words and Terms taken in different senses in the same Context, and that too, when they come nearer together than at thirteen verses distance? Thus the word *Light* in ver. 5. signifies an impersonal Thing; but in the 7, 8, and 9<sup>th</sup> verses, it denotes a Person, which *John* was not, but *Jesus* was, to wit, the Revealer of the Word or Gospel. 2. The Father was God too, and if God was *Incar-nate*, how will it be avoided that the Father was *Incar-nate*? And if it cannot, then Mr. *Edw.* will be a *Patripassian* Heretick. 3. It must be acknowledged, that Mr. *Edw.* has given a wonderful learned Explanation of the Phrase — *was made Flesh*; far more Learned than that of the old Justice — *Invasion is Invasion*. The Vulgar and Unlearned may understand something, when it is said that one Thing is made another Thing, as when *Water was made Wine*: but I doubt they will stare and know nothing, when one tells 'em that a Person was *Incar-nate*; much more when they read Mr. *Edw.* saying,

saying, That *God was Incarnate*, will they not gladly return from the Explanation to the Text? and then it will run thus, *God was made Flesh*. But was God indeed turn'd into Flesh, and ceased to be God, as the Water turn'd into Wine ceased to be Water? I'm sure Mr. *Edw.* never intends to make that an *indispensable Point of Faith*, as he calls this, *That God was Incarnate*. But this is a very hard case, that the generality of the World (which *God so loved, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting Life*) their Salvation or Damnation should still depend on the belief of, not only *obscure Texts*, but of *much more obscure Interpretations* of those Texts. Whether shall we go for the Sense of *God was Incarnate*? He sends us to 1 Tim. 3. 16. *God manifest in the Flesh*. But he might know that that reading of the Word *GOD* in that Text is a Corruption, and that instead of *God* was read *which* in the Council of *Nice*, as the accurate Examination against Mr. *Milbourn* has fully prov'd; however allowing that reading, has given a rational Sense of it. Thus we are sent for the Sense of an *obscure Text*, to a corrupt One. Whither shall we go next? It's very like that Mr. *Edw.* may next time send us to the *Athanasian Creed*, when the Scriptures fail him; That *Creed*

saith, *It is necessary to everlasting Salvation, that one believe rightly the INCARNATION of our Lord Jesus Christ,—That he is God and Man—perfect God and perfect Man—One Christ, not by Conversion of the Godhead into Flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God*: So then the sense of the *Word was made Flesh*, will be this, *God was Incarnate*, that is, not by being made *Flesh* or *Man*, but by taking *Man* into *God*; that is, *God* is now perfect *God* and *Man*. Well, but since *God* is a Person, and *Man* another Person; perfect *God* and perfect *Man* must unavoidably be two Persons: but this is the Heresy of *Nestorius* Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople*, *An. Dom.* 428. but how shall we help it? For to believe *God* and *Man* not to be two Persons, we directly contradict our Belief of *God's* being *perfect God* and *perfect Man*. If we say with *Apollinarius*, *An. Dom.* 370. That *God* and *Man* are not two Persons but one, because the *Man* had no *Human Soul* or *Understanding*, then we contradict *God's* being a perfect *Man*, and are condemn'd to eternal Damnation, as *Apollinarian* Hereticks. And if for solving these Difficulties, we should think good to hold, that indeed there were two *Natures* in *Christ* when *God* was made *Flesh*, but upon the *Union* the *Human* was swallowed up of the *Divine*, and so there was one *Nature* made of two; then we incur the



*Anathema* of the *Eutichian* Heretics.

" And it follows (saith Mr. *Edw.*) in the same verse of this " first Chapter of *St. John*, that " *this Word is the only begotten of the Father*; whence we are " bound to believe the *Eternal*, " tho ineffable, *Generation of the Son of God*.

*Answ.* Could Mr. *Edw.* be so weak as to think any Body but one deeply prejudiced, would approve of either of his Inferences from that Clause? either the *Eternal Generation*, or that we are bound to believe it as an Article necessary to Salvation? Does he not know that *Jesus* is the only *Son of God*, by reason of that *Generation* which befit him in Time? Does he read of any other *Son* that *God* generated of a *Virgin* but *Jesus*? See *Luke* 1. 35. Did *God* ever sanctify and send into the *World* in such a *Measure and Manner*, any that were called *Gods* or *Sons of God*, as he did *Jesus* our *Lord*? See *John*. 10. 35, 36, 37, 38. and *Chap.* 3. 34. Did he ever give such *Testimony* to any other? Did *God* ever beget any other *Son* by raising him from the *Dead* to an *immortal Life* (*Acts* 13. 33.) by anointing him with the *Oil of Gladness* above his *Fellows*, *Heb.* 1. 9. By setting him on his *Right-hand*, making him to inherit a more excellent *Name* than *Angels*, even that of *SON* in a more excellent *Sense*, *Heb.* 1. 3, 4, 5. By glorify-

ing *Christ*, making him an *High-Priest*, saying unto him, *Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee*? Is not *Isaac* call'd the only begotten *Son of Abraham*, though *Abraham* had other *Sons*? But for Mr. *Edw.*'s *Eternal Generation*, there is not one Tittle either in this *Text*, or in all the *Bible*; and yet he has the Confidence to bind the *Belief* of it upon *Mankind*, upon pain of *Damnation*: I wish he would not be so rash, but more reverent in so tremendous a *Point*.

Next, he finds our *Author* faulty in not taking notice, that we are commanded to believe the *Father* and the *Son*, *John* 14. 10, 11. and that the *Son* is in the *Father*, and the *Father* in the *Son*, which expresses their *Unity*. Wonderful! Did our *Author* indeed take no notice that we are commanded to believe the *Father* and the *Son*? when he all along in his *Treatise* makes the *Messiah*, *Christ*, *Son of God*, terms synonymous, and that signify the same thing; and cites abundance of *Texts* to that purpose; so that the belief of the *Father* & the *Son*, is required by him in the whole three quarters of his *Book*, which Mr. *Edw.* takes notice he spent in proving his *Proposition*. Did Mr. *Edw.* write these *Remarks*? Or did some body else add them to his *Book of the Causes of Atheism*? As for the *Unity of the Father and Son*, express he says by these words, *The Son is in the Father, and the Father*

*Father in the Son*; Does he think his Reader never read that Text in John 17. 21. *That they [Believers] all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us,* with ver. 23. Or that other Text, 1 John 4. 16. *He that dwelleth in Love, dwelleth in God, and God in him?* But for the word *Unity*, which he uses, if he means by it any more than a close Union, it implies a contradiction, that two should be one; that a Duality should be an Unity. This (saith he) is made an Article of Faith by our Saviour's particular and express Command. He must mean, that Mr. Edwards's own sense of that Text is commanded as necessary to Salvation, else he says no more of that than the Author allows concerning both that and other Scriptures. If he means his own sense, then I think he's an inconsiderate and rash Man; for I have shew'd that his sense is contradictory.

Here Mr. Edw. calls in question the sincerity of our Author, and, pag. 109. says, "It is most evident to any thinking and considerate Person, that he purposely omits the *Epistolary Writings* of the Apostles, because they are fraught with other *Fundamental Doctrines*, besides that one which he mentions.

I will not question Mr. Edwards's sincerity in what he writes, but I question much his due considering what he writes against. Does

not our Author make in effect the same Objection against himself, pag. 291. and answer it in fourteen pages, even to the end of his Book? but Mr. Edw. takes notice of very little of it. And the most of that he does take notice of, he answers with a little Railery upon the *Bulk of Mankind*, the *unlearned Multitude*, the *Mob*, and our *Author*. His note upon these Phrases, is, *Surely this Gentleman is afraid of Captain Tom, and is going to make a Religion for his Myrmidons.* — *We are come to a fine pass indeed; the venerable Mob must be ask'd what we must believe.*

Thus he ridicules the Doctrine of Faith, on which the Salvation or Damnation of the Multitude depends, and the Grounds of our Author's Design; who finding in Holy Scripture, *that God would have all Men to be saved, and come to the KNOWLEDG of the Truth; the Gospel was preach'd to the Poor, and the common People heard Christ gladly; that God hath chosen the Poor in this World, rich in Faith;* he concluded (when he had overcome the prejudices of Education, and the contempt of the Learned, and those that think themselves so) that the Gospel must be a very intelligible and plain Doctrine, *suted to Vulgar Capacities, and the State of Mankind in this World destin'd to Labour and Travel; not such as the Writers and Wranglers in Religion have made it.* To this Mr. Edw. answers (besides

sides what I have noted above) and is forced to agree, *That all Men ought to understand their Religion*: but then asks (as of a positive thing not to be doubted) *if Men may not understand those Articles of Faith which he had mention'd a little before*, pretended to be found in the Epistolary Writings, [which are generally form'd not in Scripture-Terms, and about which there is such endless Contentions] *when they be explain'd to them, as well as our Author's Article, Jesus is the Messiah?* Nay he is confident that there is no more Difficulty in understanding this Proposition [*The Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are one God or Divine Nature*] than in that other of our Author (see pag. 120.) when yet the World knows to its Cost, that this Article has exercis'd all the greatest Wits of the Church these fourteen or fifteen hundred Years to understand the Terms, and take away the Contradictions: and at this Day the English Trinitarians have most fierce Contentions among themselves about the meaning of it. The nominal Trinitarians agree with the Unitarians, that the Realists, that hold three real Persons, are Tritheists; and the Realists agree with the Unitarians, that the Nominals or Modalists destroy the Reality of the Eternal Son and Holy Ghost, and are *Patripassians* or *Sabellians*. Besides, Mr. Edw. knows that each of these

Parties are at vast difference among themselves; they easily find Inconsistences or Contradictions in one anothers Explications; so that supposing there be but ten different Trinitarian Hypotheses, (I think there are more) every one has mine against him, all which he looks upon as faulty; and they on the other Hand do all reject his. They reject them I say, not, as the Bishop of *Sarum*, in his Letter to D. W. pag. 56. would palliate Matter, as having the same Acts of Piety and Adoration, though different ways of Explaining, either the *Unity of the Essence*, or the *Trinity of the Persons*; but as having different Acts, except we can have the same Ideas when we worship three Gods, as when we worship one only; or when we worship one all-perfect Person, as when we worship three such; or when we worship one real Person, and two nominal Ones, as when we worship three Equals; or when we worship one self-existent God, and two dependent Gods not self-existent, as when we worship three Self-existents, and the like. Again, Mr. Edw's Proposition is *never once* found in Holy Writ; but our Author's often expressly. He uses Terms in such a Sense as they are never us'd in Scripture, for *Divine Nature* is never put there for *God*; nor does the word *GOD*, or *one God*, ever signify Father, Son and H. Ghost, but always one singular Person; and

and throughout the Holy Scriptures from the Beginning to the End, God is spoken of, and spoken to, as one only Person, and by Terms and Pronouns that signify singularly, and never otherwise. God indeed does twice or thrice speak of himself Plurally, as Persons of Dignity and Dominion do often. But our Author both his Words in Form, and his Explications are all taken out of Scripture; and in the Days of our Saviour and his Apostles, there was no difficulty in understanding them. The most illiterate Fishermen and Shepherds, and Women, knew what was meant by *JESUS*, and what by *Messiah*: The only Question was, whether the Proposition *Jesus is the Messiah*, was to be affirm'd, or denied. But notwithstanding all this, Mr. Edw. says, *Truly if there be any Difficulty, it is in our Author's Proposition; why pray? For here is an Hebrew word first to be explain'd before the Mob can understand the Proposition*: But by his favour, the word *Messiah* is by our Translators adopted into the English Tongue, and the common People, the Rabble (as Mr. Edw. is pleas'd to call them) understand it as well as they do the *Christ* or the *Anointed*, and also the Explications of those Terms, provided they use to read either themselves, or hear others read the Holy Scriptures. But the word *Messiah* was in our Saviour and the Apo-

stles Time most common among the Jews: therefore our Author designing to represent the Preaching and Faith of that Time, chose to use it more frequently than any other Term, see pag. 30. But I presume Mr. Edw. brought in this Objection, only as a *Diversion*. If he really think as he says, it's a sharp *Reflection* upon all the Learned Trinitarian Controversists upon this Point; except they take it more *candidly* for an Invitation to their Reverences and right Reverences, to come to the most Learned Mr. Edw. to inform their Understandings, and solve all the Difficulties that make them at so great Odds one with another: And it's to be hoped he will give such a clear Explication of the *Trinity*, as will satisfy the *Mystery-men* or Ignoramus-Trinitarians, that at length they may understand what they now profess to believe without Understanding.

But to return, for all this will seem a Digression except the Reader please to remember it is for a Vindication of our Author from Mr. Edw's hard charge, of *purposely omitting the Epistolary Writings, because fraught with other Fundamental Doctrines besides that one which he mentions*: Among those, Mr. Edw. reckons chiefly and more especially—*The Doctrine of the ever to be adored Trinity, eminently attested in those Epistles*. This Doctrine he has given us in his

Propo-

Proposition above discoursed, and has attempted to show (against Matter of Fact in all Ages, and especially in this present Time) that this Fundamental ought not to have been omitted because of its Difficulty or Unintelligibleness; for it is (he saith) less difficult than that of our Author, *Jesus is the Messiah*; but how successfully I leave to consideration. But if it be Unintelligible, or Contradictious, at least to the Bulk of Mankind, then it's impossible it should be a Fundamental Article; and therefore our Author needed not *purposely to omit the Epistolary Writings of the Apostles*, for fear of finding it there, since Mr. Edw. himself cannot find it there, nor in the Bible.

But what says he to our Author's full Answer to the Question, about the Usefulness of the Epistles, though *the Belief of many Doctrines contained in them be not necessary to Salvation*? Our Author answers, '1. That he that will read the Epistles as he ought, must observe what 'tis in them is principally aim'd at; —for that is the Truth which is to be receiv'd and believ'd, and not scatter'd Sentences in Scripture-Language, accommodated to our Notions and Prejudices. What says Mr. Edw. to that? 2. [for I abridg] There be many Truths in the Bible, which a good Christian may be wholly ignorant of, and

'so not believe; which perhaps  
'some lay great stress on, and  
'call Fundamental Articles, because they are the distinguishing Points of their Communion. What says Mr. Edw. to this?

'3. The Epistles were writ to those who were in the Faith, and true Christians already; and so could not be design'd to teach them the Fundamental Articles and Points necessary to Salvation. This he shows from the Address of all the Epistles, or something noted in them. '4.

'Their resolving Doubts and reforming Mistakes, are of great Advantage to our Knowledge and Practice. 5. The great Doctrines of the Christian Faith are dropt here and there, [He has cited some such Passages in the Proof of his Proposition]. — 'We shall find those necessary Points best in the Preaching of our Saviour and the Apostles. 6. The Epistles, besides the main Argument of each of them, do in many places explain the Fundamentals, and that wisely, by proper Accommodations to the apprehensions of those they were writ to. Which he shows particularly in the Epistle to the Romans, and that to the Hebrews; also in the general Epistles. At length, 'These Holy Writers (saith he) *inspir'd from above* writ nothing but Truth; and in most places very weighty Truths to us now; —But yet  
'every



every Sentence of theirs, must not be taken up and look'd upon as a Fundamental necessary to Salvation, without an *explicite* Belief, whereof no Body could be a Member of Christ's Church, &c. For (saith he, *pag.* 299.) 'tis plain, the contending Parties on one side or t'other, are ignorant of, nay, disbelieve the Truths deliver'd in Holy Writ, as I noted before.

This little I have transcribed out of our Author for the sake of those, who perhaps have not his Book, but have Mr. *Edwards's*, and that it may appear how *unfairly* (to say no worse) Mr. *Edw.* deals with our Author, saying, *pag.* 111. *He passes by these inspired Writings with some contempt*; also he suggests his insincerity to the Reader. But I have seen a Letter from a Gentleman of no ordinary Judgment, who says, — 'Mr. *Edwards* has not only mistook Mr. *Lock*, but abus'd and belied him: for he says, Mr. *Lock* cites only the *Gospels* and *Acts*, but declares (or insinuates) his contempt of the Epistles, as if they were not of like Authority with the *Acts* or *Gospels*; but Mr. *Lock* has no where intimated any such Opinion. His Book (saith he) shows, He has read the Scriptures with very great Observation, as well as Judgment; he suffers nothing to escape him, that belongs to the Subject he manages.

He names our Author Mr. *Lock*, which I am assured he does by common Fame and Conjecture; he has no other Grounds for it, as neither have I, no more than Mr. *Edwards*. Whether we are mistaken or not in his Name I know not, but I think I have proved that Mr. *Edw.* is much mistaken in his Judgment concerning his Book, or has perversly censur'd him and it. He is so far from condemning the Epistles, (as Mr. *Edw.* accuses him) that whoever will take the Pains to reckon, he will find he has quoted them, and refer'd to them near *FOURSCORE* times. And Mr. *Edw.* is no less Injurious in his Censures upon other Writers: In the very *Sociinian Doctrine* it self (saith he) *there seems to be an Atheistical Tang*. For proof, he cites the *Considerations on the Explications of Doct. of Trin.* *pag.* 5. Where (saith he) *the Self-existence of God, which is the Primary, Fundamental, and Essential Property—of the Deity, is peremptorily pronounc'd by them to be a CONTRADICTION*. It's strange a Man of Mr. *Edwards's* Undertaking, should give forth such a Calumny. His *Ldp. of Worcester* says, *If God was from Eternity, he must be from himself*. That Author answers, that that is an *Esponsing the Cause of the Atheists*, and he gives this Reason; *If God is from Eternity, he must be of none; neither of (or from) himself, nor from any other; not from himself, for*

then he must be before he was ; and neither from himself, nor from any other, because all Origination of what kind soever is inconsistent with an Eternal Being. Is this now peremptorily to pronounce, that the Self-existence of God is a Contradiction? or is it not to vindicate the Self-existence of God from a false Notion of it, occasion'd by the Bishop's words? But what will Mr. Edw. say to the Author of the XXVIII Propositions, &c. (who, they say, is the Bishop of Glouc.) who peremptorily denies, nay says, *It is a flat Contradiction, to say that the second and third Persons (of the Trinity) are Self-existent?* (Prop. 8.) Consequently neither of them is God: because (as Mr. Edw. says) *Self-existence is the Primary, Fundamental, and Essential Property of God*, which yet neither the Son nor the H. Ghost have. I wish Mr. Edw. would either reconcile himself to the Bishop, or the Bishop to him, before he charges an *Atheistical Tang* upon the Socinian Doctrine, upon account of the denial of God's Self-existence, which he may see strongly affirm'd in the Reflections on the said Propositions, &c.

As for Socinus's denying the Præscience of Contingencies, I am not, nor is our Author concern'd in it; but which is more dishonourable to God, to be the Author of all the Sin and Wickedness that ever was, or ever will be in the World; or to de-

ny his Fore-knowledg of the certainty of that which is not certain. Socinus and Crellius have denied such an Immensity of God, which makes him to be essentially and wholly in every point of Space; because such Immensity would take away all Distinction between God and Creature, and has indeed an *Atheistical Tang*; for the greater part of Atheists hold the Universe to be God; hence *Lucan, Jupiter est quodcumq; vides, quocumq; moveris.* Which opinion, some of the Antient Fathers have wrote against; as *Clement Alexandrinus*, and others. Mr. Edw. may charge them all with a *Tang of Atheism* if he please. As for God's Spirituality, modest Divines confess it easier to say, *What it is not, than what it is.* Mr. Edw. perhaps has attain'd to such a perfection of Knowledg in that Matter, as may make him able to teach them what they are now ignorant of: But Socinus nor Crellius, nor any other of them ever denied, contrary to most express, and often repeated Scriptures, and common Reason, the most glorious Attribute of God's Unity, which gives Excellency to all his other Attributes: for were Self-existence, Omniscience, Immensity and Spirituality, and all other Attributes common to more than One; where would the Excellency and Majesty of God's Name be? How should we love and adore him with all our Hearts

and



and Strength, when there are others that require it and have as equal right to it as he? But Mr. *Edw.* will count himself highly injur'd, if I charge him with denying God's Unity: but hold a little, be not angry; If you be, Take heed it be not more for your own sake, than for God's sake: Do you not say, that the infinite Nature of God is communicable to three distinct Persons? pag. 79. and pag. 120. That the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are one God, or Divine Nature? Are not these Terms convertible? namely, That one God is Father, Son and H. Ghost, that is, three Persons? and what are three Almighty and only wise Persons, but three Gods? The Father is one God, the Son is one God distinct from the Father, and the Holy Ghost is one God distinct from the Father and Son. Thus your Proposition amounts to this, That one God is three Gods, that the Unity of God is a Trinity of Gods. That Unity or Oneness is no longer an Attribute of God, but Trinity or Threeness. But we cannot be heard, let us make out your Contradictions never so clearly: nay, you impute it to us as a heinous Crime, that we make it an Argument against the belief of your Trinity, that it cannot be understood without Contradiction. You impute to us most injuriously, that we are to admit of nothing but what is exactly adjusted to Nature's and Reason's Light, pag.

68. That therefore the Trinity is a Doctrine that can't be born, because it can't be understood, pag. 69. and that the English Unitarians declare they cannot believe it, because Reason does not teach it, pag. 72. This is a Topick the Trinitarians do always enlarge upon, and urge with a great deal of Pomp in themselves, and Ignominy in the Unitarians, as Persons that prefer their own Reasonings before Divine Revelation how clear soever. And though this Calumny has been answer'd and wip'd away, and retorted upon them a hundred Times, yet Mr. *Edw.* will still confidently charge it. He cites the Letter of Resolution for proof of it, and therefore has read it, but passes by the Answer to this Imputation, which is to be found in the very first Page of it, where thus; 'First, 'Tis not true, ' that we prefer Reason before ' Revelation; on the contrary, ' Revelation being what GOD ' himself hath said, either immediately, or by inspired Persons; ' 'Tis to be prefer'd before the ' clearest Demonstration of our ' Reason. And in the Consider. on Explic. on 4 Serm. and a Sermon of the Bishop of Worcester, the Author says: 'He utterly mistakes ' in thinking that we deny the ' Articles of the new Christianity, or Athanasian Religion, ' because they are Mysteries, or ' because we do not comprehend ' them; we have a clear and distinct

‘ *stinct Perception*, that they are  
 ‘ not Mysteries but Contradictions,  
 ‘ Possibilities, and pure  
 ‘ Non-sense.

But now that the Trinitarians do most expressly prefer their Reasoning, Consequences and wire-drawn Deductions before Holy Scripture; besides that it has been done in the Notes upon the Athanasian Creed, and other Tracts, I shall shew further from Mr. Edwards’s Fundamental Doctrine, but now recited; if at least the Trinitarians will acknowledge him for their Orthodox Champion.

1. It’s manifest he means by the one God, not one Divine Almighty Person, but three such; but nothing is more evident in Holy Scripture, than that God is one Person only. For proof of it, I have refer’d my Reader to the Scriptures from beginning to end, in more than twenty thousand Texts, even as often as God is spoken of, or to, or speaks of himself (except as I have said). But Mr. Edw. says expressly, that his God is *three distinct Divine Persons*, to wit, the Father of the Son, the Son of the Father, and the H. Ghost which proceedeth from the Father and the Son. 2. He says, that *these three distinct Divine Persons*, [each of which is God in the most perfect Sense] *is the only true God, or the one God, or Divine Nature*. The Proposition which he advances, as necessary to

*Salvation, and more easy to be understood than that Jesus is the Messiah, is, That the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are one God, or Divine Nature*. Whereby it’s manifest, that by *ONE GOD* he means not *one Person*, but *one Divine Nature*; and by *one Divine Nature* he means such a Divine Nature as is *communicable to three distinct Persons*, see pag. 79. So that his three Persons which are one God, are *so* one God as they communicate in *one Divine Nature*; in like manner as *Peter, James and John are one Man*, because they communicate in one Human Nature, as do also all the Men in the World. Now I shall cite some Texts of H. Scripture, which do expressly declare that God is ONE; and that cannot otherwise be understood than that he is one Person, or singular intellectual Nature, Essence or Substance. Here let me premise first, How *Equivocally* Mr. Edw. and the Trinitarians express themselves in this great and necessary Point, on which depends our Eternal Salvation; and whereby the Bulk of Mankind (for I think that’s a far more decent Phrase than Mr. Edw’s *Rabble*, or *Captain Tom and his Myrmadons*, or the *venerable Mob*) cannot escape being deluded. He and they confess also, that there is but *one God*, though three Persons in that one God; but by *one God* they do not mean (as I have shewed from Mr. Edw.) *one singular intellectual*

*Intellectual Nature, Essence, or Substance* compleat, for that is a Person; and if they did, the Contradiction would presently appear to every Capacity, to wit, that three Divine Persons are one Divine Person; but they (as Mr. Edw.) say, *The Father, Son and Holy Ghost, or the three Divine Persons, are one God, or Divine Nature, Essence or Substance.* Hereby they conceal from their poor honest Reader, thirsting after Truth, that God is one *Intellectual* Perfect Nature, Essence or Substance, and make him believe by that concealment, that though there are three Divine *Intellectual* perfect Natures, yet there is but one Divine Nature or God.

I am also willing to premise, that the Grecism of a solitary Adjective Masculine, or Article without a Substantive (where the Discourse is of intellectual Beings) doth frequently, if not always connote PERSON; and our English Translators have in many Texts render'd it *Person*, as the clear Sense of the Greek Text, not as a word supplied in another Character to explain the Text, but in the same Character as a verbal Translation. Instances of this rendering are these among many others; *Mat.* 27. 24. Of this just [Person] *Luke* 15. 7. Ninety nine just [Persons] *Acts* 17. 17.—The devout [Persons] *Eph.* 5. 5.—unclean [Person] *2 Pet.* 3. 11. What manner of [Persons.] In

these places there is nothing in the Greek to answer the word *Person*, but what is implied in the Adjective.

To come now to the Texts that assert the *Unity* or *Oneness* of God, against Mr. Edw's *Trinity* or *Threeness*; or that God is one intellectual Nature, or one Person, against Mr. Edw's one Divine Nature, or three Persons: see *Jam.* 2. 19. according to the Greek, Thou believest that God is ONE, thou dost well. *Gal.* 3. 20. But God is ONE. *Mark* 12. 29. The Lord our God, the Lord is ONE, saith our Saviour out of the Law, to the Scribe that asked him, *which is the first Commandment of all?* And Jesus answer'd him, *the first of all the Commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, &c.* And in the 32<sup>d</sup> ver. *The Scribe said unto him, Well Master, thou hast said the Truth, for God is ONE,* and there is none other but he. And ver. 34. —*Jesus saw that he answer'd discreetly.* Our Bibles refer us to *Deut.* 6. 4, 5. whence our Lord takes this his Answer, and where we find the same Words, which by *Ainsworth* are also render'd, The Lord our God, the Lord is one. Now in these Scriptures the Numeral Adjective Masculine, being without a Substantive and Singular, it forces us to understand in every place *Person*. So that we nothing doubt

but the Translators would have render'd every where *God is ONE PERSON*, if they had not been prepossessed with the Opinion of God's being three Persons; the like to which they have done in many other Places. But in that Answer of the Holy Jesus to him that called him *Good Master*, *Mat.* 19. 17. it's not possible to avoid it; 1. That God is a Person; 2. That he is but *one Person*; and 3. That he is GOOD in an eminent Sense above all other Persons whatsoever. For thus he says, *Why callest thou me GOOD? None [or no Person] is good-but one [Person] the God.* How strangely perverse would it be to understand this Text in the Trinitarian sense, viz. *None, or no Person is good but one, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost?* or thus, *None, or no Person is good but one, i. e. the Divine Nature?*

Again, 2. Consider we these Texts, and see what sense we can make of them, if God be not one Person only, *Mal.* 2. 10. *Hath not ONE GOD created us?* must we say with Mr. Edw. *Hath not ONE Father, Son and Holy Ghost* [or one Divine Nature that is not a Person] *created us?* *Rom.* 3. 30. *There is one God who justifies, &c. Trin.* *There is one Father, Son and H. Ghost that justifies, Zeck.* 14. 9. *Hebr. In that Day the Lord shall be ONE, and his Name ONE.* How should the Lord be *one* and his Name *one*, if the Lord be *three*

distinct Persons, and his Name Father, Son and Holy Ghost? *Isa.* 37. 16. *O Lord of Hosts, God of Israel, thou dwellest between the Cherubims, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the Kingdoms of the Earth; thou hast made Heaven and Earth; Psal.* 86. 10. *Thou art great and doest wondrous Works, thou art God alone.* 2 King. 19. 19. — That all the Kingdoms of the Earth may know that *thou art the Lord God, even thou only.* *Isa.* 44. 24. &c. *I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the Earth by my self.* *Nehem.* 9. 6, &c. *Thou even thou art Lord alone, thou hast made Heaven — the Host of Heaven worshippeth thee.* *Isa.* 37. 20. — That all the Kingdoms of the Earth may know, that *thou art the Lord, even thou only.* 2 King. 19. 15. *Jude* 4. — denying the *only Lord God*, and our Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Tim. 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.* Ephes. 4. 6. *One God and Father of all, who is above all and through all, and in you all.* *Isa.* 46. 9. *For I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me.* 1 King. 8. 23. *Lord God of Israel, there is no God like thee in Heaven above, or in Earth beneath.* — Ver. 60. That all the People of the Earth may know that the Lord is God, and that there is none else. *Isa.* 44. 6. *I am the First,*

First, and I am the Last, and besides me there is no God. Ver. 8. Is there a God besides me? yea, there is no God, I know not any. Isa. 45. 5. I am the Lord there is none else, there is no God besides me. Verse 6.—There is none besides me, I am the Lord and there is none else. Ver. 14.—Saying, surely God is in thee, and there is none else, there is no God. Ver. 21.—Have not I the Lord? and there is no God else beside me, a just God and a Saviour, there is none beside me. Ver. 22. Look unto me, and be ye saved all the ends of the Earth, for I am God, and there is none else. Deut. 4. 35. Unto thee it was shewed, that thou mightest know that the Lord be is God, and there is none else beside him. 1 Chron. 17. 20. O Lord there is none like thee, neither is there any God besides thee. Exod. 34. 14. For thou shalt worship no other God, for the Lord whose Name is Jealous, is a jealous God. Deut. 32. 39. See now that I, even I am he, and there is no God with me. 2 King. 5. 15. Behold, now I know that there is no God in all the Earth, but in Israel. 2 Sam. 22. 32. For who is God save the Lord? See the same words in Psal. 18. 31. 1 Cor. 8. 4.—There is none other God but one. I conclude with the first and chiefest of the Ten Commandments given from Mount Sinai, Exod. 20. 3. Thou shalt have no other Gods before me—I the Lord thy God am a jealous God: and that of the Lord

Jesus, when himself was tempted, Matth. 4. 10. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. The meaning plainly is, I am a Jew, and subject to the Law of the Jews, I am commanded therein to worship the Lord my God, and to serve him only.

These Scriptures do so clearly prove, that God is a Person, or a perfect intellectual Nature or Substance, and that he is only one such; that to deny either of these Propositions, is to me to deny the Truth of Holy Scripture, not only in some obscure and doubtful Text, but in the Current of it, and in the chief Fundamental of all Religion. And Mr. Edw. in asserting there are three such Persons in one Divine Nature, renders in effect the whole Bible void and useless for the proof of any Proposition whatsoever it be. If this, that God is an absolutely perfect Being, and therefore a Person, (for Persons are the most perfect of Beings or Substances) and but one such, cannot be plainly and undeniably prov'd from Scripture, it's utterly in vain to attempt to prove any thing. For it's manifest that to assert THIS, is the chief Aim and Design of all the Holy Writers, and that they are most zealous and vehement in it. And herein lies the Controversy between the Trinitarians and the Unitarians; we assert with the greatest plainness, and fulness,



fulness, and clearness of Holy Scripture, as ever any thing was or can be exprest, that God is ONE in the *most perfect* sense of Oneness, (which is by all Men that understand the Word) in a personal Sense. But the Trinitarians do on the contrary contend, that God is *not One*, but *Three* in that personal Sense, and One in a less perfect Sense; which is not Personal, but common to many: Which is a Sense that dethrones God, and makes him either a *Third* of the one God, or *one of the Three*, that created and governs the World, and is to be ador'd by Men and Angels. For they cannot deny but that in worshipping the Father our God, we worship one God; But they rage against us, because we do not worship besides him, and distinct from him, *the Son* as perfectly God as he; as different from him as a real Son is from a real Father, and another Person as really God as either the Father, or the Son, and as really different from the Father and Son, as he that is sent is from him that sent him. And this is so evidently true, that (as I have observ'd) almost one half of the Trinitarians consent with the Unitarians, in condemning the other Party of Trinitarians as Confessors of three Gods.

But that I may give yet fuller Evidence of this Fundamental Truth of the Unity of the Person of God against the Trinity of

Persons in him, I shall in the third place produce some Texts that ascribe some Perfections to the Person of God singularly, and with exclusion of all other Persons in that Sense and Degree. Such are those, where the Holy Jesus says, *None* [or no Person] *is good but one, the God*, which I have urged before: and that in *John* 17. 3. where the Blessed Son in his Prayer to God, (wherein it were absurd to say that he pray'd to himself) calls him *Father*, and *the only true God*; and that in distinction from himself, whom he describes by the Names of *Jesus Christ*, him *whom the Father hath sent*. This Particle *only*, imports some Excellency in the Attribute of *true*, which is here given to God his Father, above and with exclusion of all others, or it signifies nothing. *Rom.* 16. 27. *To God only Wise be Glory through Jesus Christ* for ever. *Amen*. Here again the Attribute of *only Wise* is ascrib'd to the Person of God in distinction from *Jesus Christ* as the *Medium* of the Glory which is given to the only Wise God. *1 Tim.* 6. 15, 16. God is called, *the blessed and ONLY Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*; *who ONLY hath Immortality*, &c. which are all personal Titles, from which all other Persons are excluded by the exclusive Particle *only*: for there can be but one Potentate who is King of Kings in the highest Sense, and much more when *only*

is added. When Christ is called *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*, (Rev. 17. 14. and 19. 16.) it's manifest it's to be understood in a derivative Sense, because all Power in Heaven and Earth was given to him as the Lamb that had been slain; and therefore he is represented as clothed with a Vesture dipt in Blood, in that 19 Chap. ver. 13. *Who only hath Immortality*: that is, (as Dr. Hammond says) *God is Immortal in himself*, (not in three Selves) and all Immortality of others is derived from him. In the same Sense is the Lord God Almighty called, in Rev. 15. 4. *only Holy*, because he only is Holy of himself; and as it is understood, 1 Sam. 2. 2. *There is none Holy as the Lord*. Now in these and such-like Passages of Holy Scripture, the Trinitarians and Mr. Edw. must understand by *God* three Persons; by *Father*, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; by *Thou*, Ye; by *Him*, Them; by *Himself*, Themselves; and those Words the Scripture hath in the singular Number, must be understood by them plurally. It's no marvel then that they call their Doctrine a *Mystery*, and that there is so much dissension among themselves concerning it, since it cannot be understood in any Sense, which is not either contradictory in it self, or so to the full Current of Holy Scripture.

In like manner, 4thly, all those Texts (which are not a few) in

which God is named *the most High, the most high God, the Lord the most High, God most High, the Highest*; whether these Titles be Subject or Attribute, must all be understood, not of one Person, or a singular knowing and willing Substance, but either of a Substance that is not a Person, or else of three equal Persons: And all this by virtue of that scholastic and unreasonable Distinction between *Person* and *Essence*; or as Mr. Edw. words it, *The infinite Nature of God communicable to three distinct Persons*, (Pag. 79.) which Distinction being absurd in it self when understood, they obtrude upon the World under the Name of *MYSTERY* and *Incomprehensible*.

5thly. Besides, that the Holy Scriptures are so abundant in those Texts that clearly shew him to be *one Person only*, as I have fully manifested; yet I may still urge from the same Texts and others, that the Father only, whom the Trinitarians acknowledg to be but one Person, is *that God, that God alone, that one God, that God who is One, the most high God*, and no Person else besides him. I produced before the Text in *John* 17. 3. to prove that the Perfection of being *THE ONLY TRUE GOD*, is ascrib'd to him as being one Person only. Now I urge from the same Text, that that Person is the Father of the Son, in express distinction from the Son and all others.



others. Next, that Text in 1 Cor. 8. 5, 6. *Though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth, (as there be Gods many, and Lords many); but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom were all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* Which words do plainly assert, that that Person who is the one God of Christians in exclusion of all those that are called Gods, (and in some Sense may be so) is none but the Father; and in distinction from the Lord Jesus, who was made Lord and Christ in a most excellent manner, after his Resurrection. This Text must be understood by the Trinitarians thus; *There is none other God but three Almighty Persons:—There are Gods many, and Lords many, but unto us [Christians] there is but one God or Divine Nature, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; each of which is the one God of Christians, and not the Father only.* See next *Ephes. 4. 4, 5, 6. There is one Spirit—one Lord—one God and Father of all.* Where the one God and Father of all is clearly differenced from the one Spirit and the one Lord. Now see *Mat. 24. 36. But of that Day and Hour knoweth none* [or no Person] (for of necessity it must be so understood) *no not the Angels of Heaven, but my Father only.* St. Mark hath it—*neither the Son, but the Father.* These parallel Texts prove, 1. That the Person of the

Father is the Person of God; for none but that Person could then know the Day and Hour of Judgment: And, 2. that the Father only is that Person of God in exclusion of all other Persons, both Angels and Men, and of the Son himself. What shall we say of them, who in flat Contradiction to this Scripture, and the Son himself, assert, That the Son knew the Day and Hour of Judgment as well as the Father? Let us next compare that Passage in 1 Tim. 2. 5. (which I cited before) with 1 John 2. 1. The former saith, *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.* The latter says, *If any Man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous.* By which consider'd together, it appears that the one God and the Father are the same Person, for only a Person is capable of being interceded to, and the Mediator and Advocate the same: So that the Father is the Person of God, as well as the Advocate is the Person of the Mediator. But if the Reader desire to see this Point (*viz.* that the Father only is the most high God) fully and learnedly argued and defended, let him read *Crellius's* two Books of *One God the Father*, out of which I have transcribed much. In what a many Places of Scripture is Christ called the *Son of God*, and the Holy Spirit the *Spirit of God*? In every of which either  
God

God must be taken for the Father only, or Christ must be the Son of himself, and the Holy Spirit the Spirit of himself, both which are absurd.

Again, how many places of Holy Scripture are there, where some Prerogative is given to the Father above Christ, as *John* 14. 28. *My Father is greater than I?* How alham'd are the more ingenious Trinitarians of that Answer, to this Objection against the Deity of the Son, which says, *The Son was less according to his Human Nature?* *John* 10. 29. *My Father is greater than all.* It's manifest from the Context, that the Son himself is included in that word ALL. *1 Cor.* 11. 3. *The Head of Christ is God.* Christ is not the Head of himself, therefore the Father only is God. How often do Christ and the Divine Writers call the Father his God? *John* 20. 17. I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God. In *Rev.* 3. 12. he calls the Father *my God* four times. *Mat.* 27. 46. and *Mark* 15. 34. he cries out, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* His God was only the Person of the Father, and not God the Divine Nature, which according to Mr. Edw. is common to three Persons. *Ephes.* 1. 17. — The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory. *Heb.* 1. 8. Where Christ is called a God, he is also said to have a God, who anointed him.

Was he his own God, and the God that anointed him? or was the Father only? *John* 10. 18. *This Commandment have I received of my Father.* He only is God who gives Commandments to the Son. *John* 12. 49. *The Father that sent me, he gave me a Commandment what I should say, and what I should speak.* *John* 14. 31. *As the Father hath given me Commandment, so I do.* *John* 15. 10. *As I have kept my Father's Commandment, and abide in his Love.* See Chap. 4. 34. and 6. 38. and 8. 29, 55. and 17. 4. and 18. 11. Add those places wherein it's clearly taught that Christ obey'd God, *Rom.* 5. 19. *Phil.* 2. 8. *Heb.* 5. 8. *God calleth Christ his Servant,* *Isa.* 42. 1. *Mat.* 12. 18. *Isa.* 49. 5, 6. with *Al's* 13. 47. *Isa.* 52. 13. and 53. 11. *Ezek.* 34. 23, 24. and 37. 24, 25. He is called — *a Minister of the Sanctuary,* *Heb.* 8. 2. All these Texts, and a hundred more (say the Trinitarians) are answered by the Distinction of a *Divine and Human Nature in one Person*; or the second Person of God his having a Human Nature: So you are to understand that this Person of God, who is here said to be a Servant, to receive Commands and obey them, &c. is yet as perfectly Great as he, from whom he receiv'd those Commands, who has no Prerogative above him. The Servant is as great as his Lord, and he that Obey'd as he that Commanded, and

he that is sent as he that sent him ; yea, the same God is Servant and Lord, the Obeyer and Commander, the Sent and the Sender. When all these Prerogatives of the Father above the Son, and consequently above the Holy Spirit, will not prove the Father only to be the most High God ; of what use can the Holy Scriptures be to us ? What shall be the Difference between Holy Scriptures and profane Writings ? May not all the Greek Fables of their Gods, be justified by the same, or such like Distinctions ? O Father of Mercies, enlighten their Understandings, and remove their Prejudices, that they may no longer deny thee the Glory due to thee above all !

Neither is it to be passed by, that to the Father only is ascrib'd in Holy Scripture, the Creation of Heaven and Earth, to Christ never ; though in a certain way of speaking, common to the Sacred Writers, many things, or all pertaining to the new Covenant or Gospel, are said to be created (that is, modelled or put into a new and better State) by him. So in that antient Confession of Faith, call'd, *The Apostles Creed*, the Creation of Heaven and Earth is appropriated to the Father ; and both in those Apostolical Times, and to this day, Prayers and Praises are offer'd to the Father through Christ, and the Gift of the Holy Spirit is begg'd of him :

which clearly shews the Prerogative of the Father above the Son and Holy Spirit ; and consequently that he only is that Person, whom we ought to understand by the Name of GOD.

In fine, The God of *Abraham*, of *Isaac*, and of *Jacob*, the God of the Fathers, and the Father of Christ, are Descriptions of one and the same Person : So *Acts* 3. 13. — *The God of our Fathers hath glorified his Son Jesus* : and *Heb.* 1. 1. *God who—spake in times past to the Fathers by the Prophets, hath—spoken to us by his Son.* So that they who make the Son to be the God of the Fathers, make him to be *his own God* and Father.

But because I think it may give farther Light and Evidence to this great Point, wherein the Glory of God, even the Father, is so much concern'd ; I will yet further show from many plain Texts, set so as they may give Light one to another ; that the God of the Fathers, and the God and Father of Christians ; or *our God* and Father, and the God and Father of our Lord Christ ; our Heavenly Father and his Heavenly Father ; his God and our God, is one and the same Person. I present them by Couples, the first speaking of Christ, the second of us.

See *Rom.* 15. 6. That ye may glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

*Phil.* 4. 20. Now unto God our Father, be glory for ever and ever.

*2 Cor.* 1. 3. Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Mercies.

*Rom.* 1. 7. Grace be to you, and Peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

*Col.* 1. 3. We give thanks to God, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

*Eph.* 1. 2. Grace to you, and Peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

*2 Cor.* 11. 31. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ knoweth that I lie not.

*1 Thes.* 1. 1. Grace be to you, and Peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

*Heb.* 1. 8. Unto the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever. Thou hast loved Righteousness, and hated Iniquity, therefore God even thy God hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows.

*Phil.* 1. 2. Grace be unto you, and Peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

*Ephe.* 1. 3. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

*1 Tim.* 1. 2. Grace, Mercy and Peace from God our Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord.

*Eph.* 1. 17. That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory, may give unto you the Spirit, &c.

*Col.* 1. 2. Grace be unto you, and Peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

*1 Pet.* 1. 3. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

*2 Thes.* 2. 16. Now the Lord Jesus himself, and God even our Father, &c.

*John* 20. 17. Jesus saith to Mary, I ascend to my Father and your Father, and to my God and to your God.

*Gal.* 1. 4. Who gave himself for our Sins—according to the will of God and our Father.

*Mat.* 27. 46. Jesus cried—saying, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

*Philem.* 3. Grace be to you, and Peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

*Rev.* 3. 12. Him that overcometh, will I make a Pillar in the Temple of my God, and write upon him the Name of my God, &c.

*2 Thes.* 1. 1.—Unto the Church of the *Thessalonians* in God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

*John* 17. 1. —Jesus lift up his Eyes to Heaven, and said—Father, Glorify thy Son.

*Mat.* 23.

*Mat. 23. 9.* One is your Father which is in Heaven. *Psal. 115. 3.* Our God is in the Heavens.

Thus we see there is one God and Father of all (*Ephes. 4. 6.*) both of Christ, and Believers the Children of God; the same Person is the God and Father of both. It's absurd to say, that Christ the Son is his own Father, or his own God; so it's plainly contrary to Scripture to say, that any other Person is our God or our Father (in the highest Sense) but the same who is Christ's God and Father. That it is so, I appeal to the serious Thoughts of every Man and Woman that reads the Scriptures attentively, without the prejudice of Scholastick and confus'd Distinctions.

Now I shall further produce you many couples of Scriptures, which prove expressly, that the Name of GOD (when taken by way of Excellency) and the Name of FATHER (in Christ's Gospel) do signify the same singular Person. So that no one is or can be God, who is not also the Father; which Term is acknowledged to signify but one Person. This appears from the Scripture, attributing the sending of Christ; or the Son, sometimes to God; sometimes to the Father, and both frequently.

*John 3. 34.* He whom God hath sent, speaketh the Words of God;

for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him.

*Chap. 14. 24.* The Word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me.

*Acts 10. 36.* The Word which God sent to the Children of Israel, preaching Peace by Jesus Christ.

*John 5. 30.* I seek not mine own Will, but the Will of the Father which hath sent me.

*Acts 3. 26.* God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you.

*John 12. 49.* The Father which sent me, he gave me a Commandment what I should say, and what I should speak.

*1 John 4. 10.* Not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the Propitiation for our Sins.

*Chap. 4. 14.* And we have seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the World.

*Gal. 4. 4.* God sent forth his Son made of a Woman.

*John 6. 39.* And this is the Father's Will that hath sent me. See *ver. 44.*

*1 John 4. 9.* In this was manifested the Love of God toward us, because God sent his only begotten Son into the World, &c.

*John 5.*



(31)

*John 5. 24. He that heareth my Word, and believeth on the Father that hath sent me.*

*Rom. 8. 3. God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful Flesh.*

*John 20. 21. Then said Jesus, As my Father sent me, even so send I you.*

*Job. 3. 17. God sent not his Son to condemn the World.*

*Chap. 5. 23. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which sent him.*

*Job. 6. 29. Jesus answered, This is the Work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.*

*Chap. 17. 25. O Father, these have known that thou hast sent me.*

*John 17. 3. This is Life Eternal, that they might know thee (Father) the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*

*Chap. 10. 36. Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?*

*John 16. 27. The Father himself loveth you, because ye have believed that I came out from God.*

*Ver. 28. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the World; again, I leave the World, and go to the Father.*

*Ver. 30. By this we believe that thou camest forth from God.*

*John 3. 16. God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son—*

*Chap. 8. 18. I am one that bear witness of my self; and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me.*

*John 8. 42. For I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of my self, but he sent me.*

*Chap. 5. 36. The Works that I do, bear witness that the Father hath sent me.*

Hence it appears most evidently, not only that God and the Father are the same Person, and that the same is as plainly distinguished from our Lord Christ, as the *Sender* is distinct from him that is *sent*; but that the Son is no more the same God that sent him, than he is the same Father that sent him.

If Christians will still suffer themselves to be impos'd upon, under the Notion of *MISTERY*, to believe that the Son of God is the same numerical God as his Father, who sent him to do his Will, (not his own) and to be the *Propitiation* (or Mercy-seat, *Heb. 9. 5.*) for our Sins; that the *only begotten* or well-beloved Son, whom the Father (first) *sanctified* and (then) *sent* into the World, is the same God who sanctified

ified and sent him; that the miraculous Works which the Son did, did bear witness, not that the Father even God had sent him, but that the Son was that God, &c. they should no longer pretend, that their Faith concerning God and his Son Christ Jesus, in what is necessary to eternal Life, is clearly and plainly reveal'd in Holy Scripture, but that they have learnt it by Tradition from their Teachers, which yet they can no more conceive the meaning of, without contradiction to Scripture and Reason, than the Papists can their Transubstantiation, which they also believe under the Notion of *Mystery*. Let none say there is a wide Difference between the Faith of Protestants and Papists in these Cases, because Transubstantiation is contradicted by Sense, the Trinity only by Reason; for I appeal to any Man of Sense, whether we may not be as certain that one Person is not three Persons, nor three Persons one Person, as that Bread is not Flesh. If Protestants think themselves excusable in that, let them not for shame blame the Papists in this. And if both Protestants and Papists are faultless in these Points, I see not but the Heathen Polytheists will be capable of the same Charity.

The New Testament Scriptures are so full of those clear Distinctions, and opposite Relations, and Works of God, from the

*Son of God, that a Man must in a manner transcribe the whole Volume to present them all. I have given my Reader a great number of Texts already; I will yet point him to some more, which he may read at his leisure. See then 1 John 4. ver. 9 to 16. 2 Pet. 1. 17. Rom. 16. 27. John 6. 69. John 5. 26, 27. As the Father hath Life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have Life in himself, and hath given him Authority to execute Judgment also, because he is the Son of Man. The Son of God had not this Life in himself, till it was given him by the Living God his Father, not because he was God, but because he was the Son of Man. But what Ears can hear, that Life and Authority were given by the same God the Father, to the very same God the Son? Or that any Life and Authority could be given to him that was God, who had always from all Eternity, all Life and Authority in himself, and could never be without it? But I am pointing you to some Texts of Scripture. Read also Rom. 1. 9. Chap. 8. 3, 29, 31. Chap. 5. 10. Ephes. 1. 3. 1 John 1. 5, 7. Chap. 3. 21, 23. Chap. 1. 3. Gal. 1. 15. Col. 1. 10, 13. 1 Cor. 1. 9. 1 John 4. 15. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God [not that he is that God whose Son he is] God dwelleth in him and he in God. 1 John 5. 9, 10, 11. Heb. 1. 1, 2. John 3. 16, 17. Acts 3. 26. 1 Thess. 1. 9, 10. John 5. 18.*  
2 John



2 *John* ver. 3. *Gal.* 4. 4. *Acts* 3. 13. These Texts do undeniably prove, that God is one Person only, to wit, the Father of the Son; and as the Son cannot be his own Father, so neither that God who is his Father. But I proceed, see *Mat.* 14. 33. and 16. 16. *Luke* 1. 35. *Mark* 1. 1. *John* 1. 34. and 20. 31. These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have Life through his Name. The Apostle *John* did not write his Gospel (as some pretend) to prove that Jesus was God, who was his Father, but that he was the Christ, or a Man anointed with the Holy Ghost and Power, the Son of that God who anointed him; and that so believing we might have Life through him. *Mark* 1. 11. *Mat.* 3. 17. *Luke* 3. 22. *Mark* 9. 7. *Luke* 9. 35. *Heb.* 1. 5. 1 *John* 4. 14. *Mat.* 11. 27. *Luke* 10. 22. *John* 1. 14. and 3. 18, 29. and 14. 28. and 15. 10. and 20. 17.

Against all these Scriptures, and many more that might be alledged, it's urged that the Son is somewhere called God [or rather a God] in Scripture. To which I answer, that both Angels and Men are called God, and Gods, and Sons of God in Scripture; see *Exod.* 7. 1. —I have made thee [Moses] a God to Pharaoh. *Exod.* 4. 16. compar'd with *Chap.* 3. 2, 5. an Angel is called *Jehovah* and *Elohim*; in English, the Lord and

God. *Psal.* 8. 5. Thou hast made him [Man] a little lower than the Angels; in Hebrew, than the Gods. And *Judg.* 13. 22. *Manoah* said —We shall surely die, because we have seen God; so he calls the Angel that appeared to him. But the word God taken by way of Eminency for the Father of all, signifies also the God of Gods, *Deut.* 10. 17. *Joshua* 22. 22. *Psal.* 136. 2, &c. The most high God, *Gen.* 14. 18. *Heb.* 7. 1. And the Lord Jesus being stoned and charged with Blasphemy by the Jews, for saying, that he and his Father were one, as we read *John* 10. 29, 30, &c. he vindicates himself by the Authority of that Text, in *Psal.* 82. 6. where it's Divinely written, I said ye are Gods, speaking of the Judges and Princes, who receiv'd their Authority and Power from God; and all of you Sons of the most High: and argues from it thus, Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am THE SON of God? Which is in effect to say, I may with far greater right than they, be called a God, or the Son of God, who have received from God far greater Authority and Power; being sanctified to such a Degree, and sent among Men to preach such a Doctrine and Work, such Miraculous Works, as plainly shew, that the Father is in me, and I in him; that is, there is such a close

E Union

Union between us, as if the Father dwelt in me, and did the Works which I do, (dwelling as it were in him) and which cannot be done by any other Power. Whence I argue, that if in any Text of Scripture, Jesus is said to be God or a God, (tho he himself never said he was God; *Nunquam seipse Deum dixit*, as saith *Lactantius*) it is to be understood of that Godlike Power, Authority and Glory, which God his Father has conferr'd upon him; for which he is to be honoured as the Father who sent him, who anointed him, who raised him from the Dead, and set him at his own Right Hand. So in *Heb. 1. 8, 9.* where in the Words spoken of *Solomon, Psal. 45.* he is called *God*, he is said to have a God above him, who anointed him. Let them consider who say, the Son is *God* in the same sense as the Father, how they can clear themselves of Blasphemy. Such Persons look upon the Unitarians with Amazement and Horrour, because they will not take the term *God* in that Sense as themselves do: *What! Deny Christ to be God, so expressly spoken of him in Holy Scripture!* In the mean time, they do not reflect upon themselves, who make to themselves (by understanding Scripture in another Sense than Christ understood it in) another God besides the Father, who only is the true God. The Unitarians acknowledg and

celebrate *one God* the Father, the Trinitarians do so too, but they also acknowledg and celebrate *two other Persons*, each of which is God in the same sense as the Father, neither of which is the Father. Which of us are safer, and in less danger of being Blasphemers, and worshippers of more Gods than one?

There's nothing more manifest in Holy Scripture, than that the only true God hath given to the Son both his Being, and all whatsoever that he enjoys; he has exalted him to his Right Hand, given him all Power in Heaven and in Earth, as *Pharaoh* exalted *Joseph* in *Egypt*; *only in the Throne* (saith he) *will I be greater than thou.* But the Trinitarians will not suffer the Father to enjoy that Privilege; They are asham'd of that Son of God (and his words) who is not as great as his Father; though he said, *My Father is greater than I.* They are asham'd of his words, who said, *Of that Day and Hour — knoweth none, not the Son, but the Father only.* and say in Contradiction to him, *The Son did know that Day and Hour as well as the Father, and not the Father only.* They are asham'd of his Words who said, *I can do nothing of my self; I came not to do my own Will, but the Will of him that sent me; my Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me; I—do nothing of my self, but as the Father hath taught me I speak these things; I have not spoken* of

*of my self, but the Father that sent me, he gave me a Commandment what I should say, and what I should speak; The word that I speak, I speak not of my self, but the Father that abideth in me he doth the Works.* These and many other Words and Sayings of the same kind, they seem to be ashamed of, and say, and contend for it, that he could do all things of himself, that he came to do his own Will, that his Doctrine was his own, that he had no need of the Father's teaching, &c. They are ashamed of those words of Christ's; Mat. 19. 17. *Why dost thou call me good? none is good but one, the God; and say none is good but Three, God and God and God, or Father, Son and Holy Ghost.*

Here let me observe to the Reader. (as I have hinted above) that there is a considerable Difference between that particle *one* in this Text, and the same particle *one* in that supposititious Text, 1 *Joh. 5. 7.* These three are *one*; for here *one* is of the Neuter Gender, as is manifest both in the Greek and Latin, and signifies as the same word does in 1 *Cor. 3. 8.* *He that planteth and he that watereth are one*: but in the Text above, *one* is of the Masculine Gender, and must be understood of one Person (or intelligent Being) who is good, and none but he, to wit, *the God.* If they were not hinder'd by strong Prejudices, they might easily see, that whatsoever they

attribute to the Son, be it eternal necessary Existence, Almightyness, or Omniscience, &c. they take away from the Father thereby, not only the Glory of enjoying those Divine Excellencies alone, but also the Glory of his free Goodness, and the Son's, and our Thankfulness for such unspeakable Benefits both to him and us, as he has been graciously pleas'd to give unto the Son, either in begetting him, or raising him up in Time, or in rewarding him both for his and our Good. Nay, they make the Son incapable of receiving those great and glorious Rewards, of all *Power in Heaven and Earth* given to him, of an *everlasting Kingdom*, of a *Name above every Name*, of exaltation to the *Right Hand of God*, and the like, which the Scriptures are full of: For how could any of these Blessings be given to him that was God always, even from Eternity? Could God sit at the Right Hand of God in any sense whatever? These are the absurd Doctrines, which make the Trinitarians contend so fiercely one with another, and with us. God will judg the World, and between them and us, by that *Man whom he has ordained to be Judge of the Dead and Living.*

But to return to the Consideration of those Texts that are alledg'd for the Son's being called *God*; that in *John 1. 1.* I have spoken of already, as also that

in 1 Tim. 3. 16. That in Rom. 9. 5. is read without the word *God* in the *Syriac*, and in the Writings of *St. Cyprian*, *Hilary* and *Chrysostom*; whereby it's probable it was not originally in that Text. But *Erasmus* acknowledges that for a good Reading, which points the Clause so as to render it a Thanksgiving to the Father thus, *The God over all be blessed for ever*, to wit, for his Benefits in raising up Christ of the Fathers, &c. And it seems to have been so read by some of the Antients, for they reckon it among the Heresies to say, that *Christ was God over all*, as *Origen* contr. *Cels.* and others. In 1 John 3. 16. The word *God* is not found: but in very few Greek Copies; and if it be read there, admits of a good Sense, without making God to die, who only hath Immortality. As also doth that Text in Acts 20. 28. which may be render'd, Feed the Church of *God*, which he hath purchased with the Blood of his own Son; but the truer Reading according to the *Syriac*, the *Armenian*, and most antient Greek Bibles, is, *Christ* instead of *God*. Most of the Antient Fathers read *Christ* or *Lord*. Those words in 1 John 5. 21. *This is the true God*, which some refer to the Son, are plainly to be refer'd to the Father, signified by *him that is true*, through his Son Jesus. *This* [He that is true] (whose Son Christ is) is the true God. Lastly, They urge that

in John 20. 28. where *Thomas* being convinced by the clear Testimony of his Senses, that Christ was risen from the Dead, answered and said unto him, *My Lord and my God*: which words, whether they are words of Admiration, respecting God that raised him from the Dead, or him that was raised: to be a Prince and Saviour (Acts 5. 30, 31.) a Lord and a God; the term *God* cannot signify in this latter sense, any other than a God or Christ, made so by Resurrection. 'Tis a clear Case, that the Evangelist could not intend by these words, to teach us that Jesus was *God*, when he tells in the last Verse, that they and his whole Book were written, *That we might believe that Jesus is the Christ the SON of God, and that believing we might have Life through his Name*.

I have insisted long upon this Point of the Oneness of God, partly because it is a Matter of the highest Moment in Religion; partly to shew, that if our Author had a Design (as Mr. Edw. says he had) to exclude the Belief of the Trinity (or Threeness of God) from being a Point necessary to Salvation, it was a Pious and Christian Design; and that Mr. Edw. has been so far from offering any thing to prove that Faith to be so necessary, that he has not proved it a true Doctrine; but on the contrary, I have proved it to be false, and highly dishonourable

nourable to the ever-blessed God and Father of Christ, contrary to the clear and full Current of Scripture, obscuring the true Glory of Christ, and very injurious to the Peace and Hope of Christians.

But after all, whether our Author is of my mind in this Matter; or whether he believes that the Doctrine of three coequal Almighty Persons is a Truth, but not Fundamental, I cannot determine: but methinks Mr. Edwards's concluding him *all over Socinianiz'd* in this Point, is done upon such Grounds, as will argue the Holy Evangelists to be also Socinians: for he says, *This Writer interprets the Son of God to be no more than the Messiah*: and I am much perswaded, that whoever shall read the Gospels with any attention, will find the Holy Writers to be of the same Mind; and our Author has fully prov'd it in his Book, but more particularly from pag. 48. to 61. and pag. 95. Yea the comparing the Evangelists in the relation of one and the same Story alone may do it; for what in *Matthew* is express'd by, *Thou art the Messiah the Son of the Living God*, chap. 16. 16. the same is in *Mark*, Chap. 8. 29. *Thou art the Messiah*; and in *Luke* 9. 18. *The Messiah of God*. And if you compare 1 *John* 5. 1. with ver. 4, 5. you will easily see the *Christ* or *Messiah*, and the *Son of God*, are Terms of the same Import. Be-

sides, the very word *Messiah* or *Christ* signifying *Anointed*, and so interpreted in the Margin of our Bibles, *John* 1. 41. is in the 49th verse, understood by *Nathanael* to be *the Son of God, the King of Israel*. For the Kings of Israel in the Letter and Type, were constituted Kings by Anointing; hence God is said to *anoint David King over Israel*, 2 *Sam.* 12. 7. and *Psal.* 2. 2. he is called *the Lord's Anointed*; but in verse 27. upon that very account, the Lord said, *Thou art MY SON, this Day have I begotten thee*. Now as the first and second verses of this Psalm, are by the Apostles and Believers, applied to God's Holy Child [or Son] *Jesus*, who as *David* is called the *Lord's Christ*, *Acts* 4. 25, 26, 27. so upon God's raising again of *Jesus* to be a Prince and a Saviour, the Apostle *Paul* does expressly apply to him that glorious Proclamation in the 7th verse, saying, *As it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art MY SON, THIS DAY have I BEGOTTEN THEE*, *Acts* 13. 33. And the Author to the *Hebrews*, Chap. 1. 4, 5. speaking of the Son's being made better than the Angels, proves it from this, that God said not at any time to any of them, as he did unto *Jesus*, [in his Type *David*] *Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee*; and in his Type *Solomon*, *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son*, 2 *Sam.* 7. 14. Moreover we have seen



seen before, that our Lord vindicates to himself the Name of the *Son of God*, by a Text out of the 82d Psalm, where the mighty Judges and Princes are called *Gods*, and *Sons of the most High*, John 10.

These things consider'd, will I think justify our Author in interpreting the *Son of God* to be no more than the *Messiah*, or will condemn the Divine Writers (if not the *Messiah* himself) in the same Crime.

Another Evidence of our Author's being Socinian, is (according to Mr. Edw.) that he expounds Joh. 14. 9, &c. after the *Antitrinitarian Mode*, whereas generally Divines understand some part of those words concerning the Divinity of our Saviour. He says,—generally Divines, &c. By this mark those Divines that do not so interpret, must be Socinians: the Socinians owe Mr. Edw. their thanks, for adding to their Number many Learned and able Divines; but I doubt those Divines will not thank him for it. But Mr. Edw. has Courage enough to call a most Learned and right Reverend Father, *Wavering Prelate*, and to bring in his Doctrine about Fundamentals, as favouring the Causes of Atheism, if he and those other Divines agree not with him in their Sentiments.

Another mark of Socinianism is that our Author makes Christ and Adam, to be the *Sons of God*—by their *BIRTH*, as the *Racovians*

generally do. That they both make Christ to be the Son of God by his Birth, and that truly according to that Text of *Luke* 1. 35. cannot I think be denied by any that duly considers the Place; but that either the one or the other make *Adam*, who was never born to be so, in like manner by his Birth, is Mr. Edwards's Blunder, and not their Assertion.

I have not taken notice of the other Fundamentals which Mr. Edw. reckons in his System, (divers of which are not found in Holy Scripture, either Name or Thing, expressly, or by consequence) because he insists chiefly on the Doctrine of the Trinity; which however it is believed by Learned Men, to be in some sense or other (they cannot agree in what sense) a Truth; yet some of the most Learned of them do not believe it a Fundamental and necessary Truth, particularly Mr. *Limborch* (than whom this present Learned Age does not afford a more Learned and able Divine) could not defend Christian Religion, in his most famous and weighty Disputations against the Jews, without waving that Point; one of which we have in his *Amica Collatio cum erudito Judæo*, &c. the ablest Jew (I presume) that ever wrote in Defence of *Judaism* against Christianity. Another Conference I am informed we may hope shortly to see, in his Reduction of an eminent Person, who

who was upon the Point of forsaking the Christian Religion, and embracing for it that of the Jews at Amsterdam, when first the ablest Systemers had tried their utmost skill and could not effect it. Perhaps Mr. Edw. means him for one, when he says, our Author's *Plausible Conceit* found reception (if it had not its birth) among some Foreign Authors besides Socinians, pag. 104. Indeed he had cause enough, for Mr. Limborch tells the Jew expressly (in the Book I named, Chap. 9. Pag. 218.) *Quando exigitur fides in Jesum Christum, nusquam in toto novo Testamento exigi ut credamus Jesum esse ipsum Deum, sed Jesum esse Christum, seu Messiam olim promissum, vel quod idem est, esse Filium Dei; quoniam appellationes Christi & filii Dei inter se permutantur.* "When we are requir'd to believe in Jesus Christ, we are no where in all the New Testament requir'd to believe that Jesus is the very God, but that Jesus is the Christ or the Messiah, that was of old promised, or which is the same, that he is the Son of God; because those Appellations of Christ and of Son of God are put one for another. So that in Company of Mr. Limborch and other eminent Divines, as well as our English Bishops and Doctors, our Author may still believe the Doctrine of the Trinity to be a Truth, though not necessary, absolutely necessary to make one a

Christian, as Mr. Edwards contends.

But why does he make mention of only the Right Reverend Fathers, one Reverend Doctor, and the foreign Divines and Socinians, as Favourers of this *Plausible Conceit*, of making nothing necessary and Fundamental, but what is EVIDENTLY contain'd in Holy Scripture as such; and so is accommodated to the apprehension of the Poor, that hear and read the Scriptures, making them also capable of being saved, though they are either ignorant of, or do not believe aright those Truths, which, though deliver'd in Scripture, are yet either hard to be understood, or difficultly infer'd, or have no mark of Fundamental, either in themselves, or in Divine Revelation; and for those Reasons cannot be made evident to the despised common People, which the Lord Jesus came to save as well as the Learned? He might also have charg'd the sixth Article of the Church of England with this *Plausible Conceit*, which has so much Evil and Mischief in it, tending to reduce the Catholick Faith to nothing, pag. 122. For that Article saith thus; "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any Man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith. Observe here, that

that every necessary Article must be read expressly, or at least proved thereby, and to whom is this Proof to be made? even to the WEAK-EST NODDLES of those that are requir'd to believe it. Absolutely there is not one Man or Woman of the venerable Mob, that (according to Mr. Edw.) can be saved, because they cannot possibly have the Article of *the three Persons that are one* prov'd to them from Scripture; for it's evident the Learned, even of the Clergy, cannot prove it to one another, much less to vulgar Understandings. And Mr. Chillingworth (the ablest Defender of the Religion of Protestants, that the Church ever had) says (and ingeminates it) —*The BIBLE, the BIBLE, I say the BIBLE only is the Religion of Protestants; whatsoever else they believe besides it, and the plain IRREFRAGABLE and INDUBITABLE Consequences of it, well may they hold it as a Matter of Opinion, but not as a Matter of Faith or Religion; neither can they with confidence to their own Grounds believe it themselves, nor require the Belief of it from others, without most High and most Schismatical Presumption, Ch. 6. N. 56.* Will Mr. Edwards say, His Fundamentals are such irrefragable and indubitable Truths, about which there are among Protestants such hot and irreconcilable Contentions? Again, that most judicious Author lays this as the unmoveable Foun-

dation of his whole Discourse against the Papists, viz. *That all things necessary to Salvation are evidently contain'd in Scripture; as the Church of England does, (see Pref. N. 30.)* And he shows in the following Paragraphs, to N. 38. That all the Jesuits Arguments against Protestants are confuted by it. But that's not all, the same Author after Dr. Potter affirms, *That the Apostles Creed contains all those points of Belief, which were by God's Command of Necessity to be preached to all, and believed by all:* And yet he says in the same Paragraph, *That all Points in the Creed are not thus necessary; See Chap. 4. N. 23.* Now what more or less hath our Author asserted in his whole Book? For I have shewed out of him, and it's evident to the Impartial; that his Proposition, that *Jesus is the Messiah or Christ*, does comprehend or clearly imply all the Articles of necessary Christian Faith in the Creed. For, though it was sufficient to constitute a Believer during the Life of Christ, to believe him to be the Christ, although they had no explicate Belief of his Death and Resurrection to come; yet afterwards those Articles were necessary, being undoubted Evidences of his being the Messiah, as our Author pag. 31. And therefore Mr. Edw. is very injurious to him, in representing his Proposition, as if it were only the believing the Man called *Jesus* to

to be *the Messiah*, an *Hebrew word*, that signifies in English *Anointed*, without understanding what is meant by that Term, see *pag. 121.*

But why should I expect that Mr. *Edw.* should have any regard to Mr. *Chillingworth's* Judgment, and all those, the Vice Chancellor, the Divinity-professors, and others that licens'd and approv'd his Book, when he has none for the Pious and Learned Bishop *Fer. Taylor*, and those others? Nay, when those numerous plain Testimonies, which our Author has quoted out of the Holy Scriptures themselves, do but provoke his Opposition and Contempt; though the Divine Writers add these Sanctions to the Belief of our Author's Proposition, or of those Words and Sentences that are of the same Import, and comprehended in it, viz. *He that believeth shall be saved, or shall never thirst, or shall have eternal Life*, and the like: On the contrary, *He that believeth not shall be condemned, or shall die in his Sin, or perish*, and the like. However I doubt not but my impartial Reader will consider both what my Author, and what my self have said in this Point.

Having thus made it appear, that the reducing of the Fundamentals of Christian Faith to a few, or even to one plain Article deliver'd in Scripture expressly, and often repeated there, and in divers equipollent Phrases, easy to be understood by the POOR,

and strongly enforcing the Obedience of the *Messiah*, (as is our Author's Proposition) is far from having any tendency to Atheism or Deism; I shall now retort this charge upon Mr. *Edw.* and show that on the contrary, the multiplying of speculative and mysterious Articles as necessary, which are neither contain'd in Scripture expressly, nor drawn thence by any clear and evident Consequence, but are hard to be understood, especially by the *common People*, having no rational Tendency to promote a good Life, but directly to the high Dishonour of the one God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the subversion of the Hope and Peace of Christians, as I have manifested in one and the chief of Mr. *Edw's* Fundamentals, and of other Systemers: This I say has been, and is one great Cause, or chief occasion of that Atheism and Deism that is in the World.

1. Mr. *Edw.* himself tells us, That "Undue Apprehensions of a Deity join'd with superstitious on, are the high road to Atheism, *pag. 34.* — Therefore imposing of false Doctrines, concerning the Attributes of God, is very pernicious, for they are destructive of his very Being and Nature. But I have shew'd that the imposing of the Doctrine of *three Almighty Persons*, or personal Gods, is a false Doctrine, and destroys one of the chief At-

tributes of God, therefore is (according to Mr. *Edw.*) *destructive of his very Being and Nature*, pag. 35. Again, another of Mr. *Edw.*'s Fundamentals is, *That full Satisfaction is made by the Death of Christ to the Divine Justice*; which Doctrine does clearly destroy the Attribute of the *Divine Mercy*: for every one may readily perceive, that full satisfaction to Justice by Punishment, cannot consist with Pardoning Mercy; when a Judge punishes according to full Justice, he does not at all forgive or shew Mercy. But that they may not be seen to destroy altogether the Mercy of God, they make him to inflict that Punishment upon himself in a Human Body and Soul. Will not these false conceptions of the Deity expunge at last the Belief of the true one? Mr. *Edw.* says false ones will.

2ly. Another occasion, Mr. *Edw.* says, *Atheists take from our Divisions, Broils and Animosities, from the many Parties and Squadrons of Sects that are in the World, to bid defiance to all Religion.* And is it not manifest that those Divisions, &c. arise chiefly from those Doctrines that are Mr. *Edw.*'s Fundamentals? I have intimated already, there are many Divisions of Trinitarians, and how hotly they contend with one another, and upon Unitarian Principles. And whoever shall but peep into Ecclesiastical History, may soon see that their *Trinity* has been such a

bone of Contention as has exercised the Wits and Pens of Churchmen these 1400 Years; for so long it is, and longer since Christians departed from the simplicity of the Faith, as it was preached by our Lord Christ and his Apostles. And now when the Unitarians and our Author would bring Christians back to that simplicity, in which the *Gospel was preached to the Poor*, and they understood it and receiv'd it; this pious Design is ridicul'd, and the Salvation of the Bulk of Mankind is set at nought; Mr. *Edw.* may well conclude that this conduct gives occasion to Atheistical Persons.

3ly. He says, pag. 63. *When Persons observe that the very Divinity of our Blessed Lord and Saviour is toss'd and torn by rude Pens—what can they think of the other great Verities of Christianity?* But Mr. *Edw.* mistakes, it's not the opposition that is made to the supreme Divinity of the Son of God, but the asserting it, that inclines Men to disbelieve Christianity. Had many that are now Deists, been sooner acquainted with the Doctrine of one God even the Father, and of one Man the Mediator between God and Men, it's very probable they would have continued Christians; for there are some that of Deists have been reconcil'd to the Christian Faith by the Unitarian Books, and have profess'd much Satisfaction therein. But I must confess it's a very handsome rebuke



buke Mr. *Edw.* gives to his own Party, when he blames the *Anti-trinitarians*, *That they have provok'd some of them to an undecent sort of Language concerning these Holy Myseries*: so that some of these latter have hurt the Cause, it may be almost as much by their Defending it; as the others have by their Opposing it. I must lay up this for a curious Figure in Rhetorick: He cuts some dignified Persons through the Unitarians sides; and so whoever is in Fault, they must bear the Blame. But if the Unitarians have Truth, and necessary Truth on their side, then they are not faulty, even as Christ and the Apostles were not faulty, though they preach'd the Gospel which set the Son against the Father, &c. and produc'd not Peace but a Sword: And the Reformers were not faulty in vigorously opposing the Popish Faith, even unto Blood. But whoever will attentively consider it, may see it's the Nature of the Trinitarian Doctrine, that it cannot be defended without being expos'd, so that when the most Learned of the Party labour to defend it, they necessarily run into one Absurdity or other; which being perceived by the next Learned Man, he exposes him: and a Third sees the weakness of each of them: and a Fourth Man spies Flaws in every of them. This produces various Hypotheses, and makes them a Scorn to Atheists, and enclines others to Deism.

For the obscuring of a Contradiction will not take it away. Contradictions are stubborn Things, and will never yield to any Reconciliation whatsoever. God will never be more than One real Person, and One Person will never be Three real Persons. And if Trinitarians will (as they do) make that a Fundamental of Religion, which contradicts the best Reasonings of Mankind, whereby they prove the Existence of God and his Unity, viz. *That he is that Being which IS necessarily and by himself, and so consider'd not in Kind, but in Act; wherefore if you suppose more Gods, then you will necessarily find nothing in each of them why any of them should be.* Grotius de verit. Chr. Relig. in initio. And if the Trinitarians cannot explain their Doctrine to one another, so as to clear it from introducing more Gods than one, no marvel then that loose Men (who yet reason as the incomparable Grotius, and other Learned Men do) do thence deny there is any God at all. The Learned allow there is not necessarily any God, if you suppose more than one: The Trinitarians say he is more than one; Men who think it their Interest there should be no God, conclude thence, it's equal in reason to believe there is no God as three. And Mr. Norris joins them with his Suffrage in the Point; I think it (saith he) a greater Absurdity, that there should be more Gods

*Gods than one, than that there should be none at all. Reason and Relig. p. 59.*

And if some Men take occasion from such reasonings as these to turn Atheists, it may easily be conceiv'd, that Men that are more Sober, and find strong and irresistible Reasons for the Existence and Unity of God, but see clearly that Christians worship Three, and besides that, hold divers other absurd Doctrines for Fundamentals; such Men (I say) must of necessity forsake Christianity, and turn Deists. Thus it's most manifest, that the Unitarians take the direct Course to prevent Atheism and Deism, by letting the World see, that those Fundamentals are no Doctrines of Christ; but that the necessary Faith of Christ is a plain and short Doctrine, easy to be understood by the Poor, and clearly express'd in Scripture, most reasonable in it self, and most agreeable to the Unity and Goodness of God, and other the Divine Attributes.

I shall now in the 4<sup>th</sup> Place shew how the Obscurity, Numerousness, and Difficulty of understanding Systematical Fundamentals promotes Deism, and subverts the Christian Faith, and that in a notorious Instance. It's matter of Fact, and evident to the whole World, that the *Quakers* are a very numerous People; and form'd into a compact Body, in which they exercise strict Discipline, as to what concerns their Party.

They will not own any other Denomination of Christians or others for the People of God, but themselves only; all others are of the World. They utterly disown the Scriptures as the Rule of Faith; they decry it as *Letter, Carnal, Dust, &c.* Their Principle is, that their Religion is taught them by Inspiration or Revelation of a Light within, whereof every Man has a Measure, but they only hearken to it, and obey it; They give the Scripture the place of bearing witness to their inward Light, as the Woman of *Samaria* to Christ: They turn the Gospel into an Allegory, and consequently make use of the Words and Phrases of the Scripture, as that *Christ is the Word, the Light, the Teacher, the Word in the Mouth and Heart; that Christ died, and rose, and ascended, and is in Heaven,* and the like; but all in a mystical or spiritual Sense, as they call it. By all which things, and indeed by the whole Tenour of their Books, Preachings and Professions, they appear to be *Deists* and not Christians. *George Fox's Book*, titled, *The great Mystery*, will give full satisfaction in this Point. And they have all along been charg'd by other Denominations to be no *Christians*, and that *Quakerism is no Christianity*. However retaining still the Words wherein the Christian Faith is express'd, though in an *equivocal* Sense; and having some among them (as

*George*

George Keith and others) who still believ'd the Gospel in the proper Sense, they made a shift to be reputed generally Christians. And indeed this Conduct of theirs deceived even many of their own Party, which is manifest in *William Rogers of Bristol, Francis Bugg, Thomas Crispe, John Pennyman*, and especially in *George Keith*; who having been a Quaker about 30 Years, yet did not till within these three or four Years discover the Infidelity of the Primitive and true Quakers, who are deservedly call'd *Foxonians*, because holding the Principles of *George Fox* their Author. But *G. Keith* living in *Pennsylvania*, (where the Quakers were *Governours*, and might be free to open their Minds plainly): did then perceive they did not believe the Doctrine of the *Apostles Creed*, the summary of Christian Faith, which made him preach it and contend for it more earnestly. This provok'd the *Foxonians* so far, that it came to a Breach and Separation, and at length to Impeachment, Fines and Imprisonment. Then *G. Keith* returns to *London*, where the matters in Contest between him and the *Foxonians* of *Pennsylvania*, was taken into Consideration, and had divers Hearings by the general Annual Meeting of Quakers, 1694, who gave a kind of a Judgment in the Case, but no clearer Determination of the principal Matter concerning *Christ within*, and *Christ*

*without*, and the other Articles of Christian Faith, than their former equivocal Expressions. The next Year 1695, at the like General Meeting, they absolutely excommunicate *G. Keith*, and make this the Ground of it, *viz.* that he had not given due observance to their former Order, and was troublesome to them in his Declarations, &c. For he had still continued to preach frequently *Christianity* as before. See a late Book, titled, *Gross Error and Hypocrisy detested*, &c. The Reader I hope will excuse it, that I have detain'd him in this long Story, because it was necessary for me first, to prove the Quakers are *Deists*, and then to proceed and shew,

*Secondly*, That the Obscurity, Ambiguity, and Numerousness of *Systematical Fundamentals*, is that which is the chief Cause of their being *so*: For not being able to satisfy themselves in understanding and determining the Truth and Certainty of those Fundamentals; for the proof of which Scriptures were alledg'd; but those of so doubtful a sense, and variously interpreted by opposite Parties, that they readily embrac'd *George Fox's* only Fundamental of the *Light in every Man*; that is in reality the *natural Light*, whereby we distinguish between Good and Evil in ordinary; whence it is that (as saith the Apostle *Paul*) *We (as the Gentiles) are a Law to our selves, and our Thoughts accuse*

or excuse, Rom. 2. 14, 15. Which is in Truth an excellent Doctrine, and has great certainty and clearness in it. But *G. Fox* preaches this, not as a natural Principle, but 1. As a supernatural Revelation: And 2. Christ being call'd in Scripture, *the Light that lighteth every Man*, and the *Light of the World*, because he brought the Light of the Gospel into the World; *George Fox* applies these Terms and Phrases, and almost every thing that is spoken of Christ, to *the Light in every Man*, and so turns the plain sense of the Gospel into a Parabolical or Mystical Sense, and makes the Christian Scripture to speak nothing but Deism. 3. *G. Fox* adds certain Observances of giving no respect in Word or Gesture, or Title, nor speaking as others speak, nor saluting as others salute, nor paying Tithes, nor using the Sword, nor swearing in common Form, &c. and all as inspired Dictates, that so the only People of God might be separated from all the World, and they serve admirably for that purpose. Now if you consider the experimented certainty of their Principle, *the Light within*, that accuses and excuses, and their Perswasion that it was a Divine Inspiration, which also was confirm'd to them by their giving obedience to those Ceremonies which were so contrary and offensive to the World, and expos'd them to much Suffering;

[All suffering for Religion, especially for a clear Revelation from God, confirming the Sufferers in their Perswasion:] You may clearly perceive it was the Uncertainty, Obscurity, and Intricacy of their former Principles, which induced them to embrace *G. Fox's* Religion, which is all dictated by the Spirit of God in every Man. Whence it is, they upbraid other Professors with *Doubtfulness* and *Fallibility*; and every one of them counts himself as infallible as the Papists do the Pope. *How can ye but delude People* (says *G. Fox*) *that are not infallible?* Myst. p. 33.

Lastly, The Obscurity, Uncertainty, and Multiplicity of Fundamentals, is that which has given an Argument to Popish Priests and Jesuits, wherewith to seduce Protestants to Popery. For evidence of *this*, I shall mind you of a Paper written by a Jesuit, in the late King *James's* time, titled, *An Address presented to the Reverend and Learned Ministers of the Church of England, &c.* The purport of which is, *That all things necessary to Salvation are not clearly contained in Scripture*, as Protestants hold; because the *Belief of a Trinity, one God and three Persons, is necessary to Salvation, but not clearly contain'd in Scripture*. Then he goes about to shew, that the Scriptures commonly alledged for the Trinity, admit of another sense. He goes the same way in the

the Article of the *Incarnation*. Thus supposing these Articles to be necessary to Salvation (as Protestants hold) and not clearly contain'd in Scripture; it follows that the undoubted Certainty of them must be found in the Determinations of the Church; and then that Church which professes *Infallibility* is the only Refuge; and I believe as the Church believes, sup-  
plies all other Articles. No Certainty any where else; but Certainty must be had in these Points. Here the making of those Articles Fundamental, which cannot be clearly prov'd from Scripture, subverts the Sufficiency and Clearness of Scripture, and sends poor Protestants to *Rome*, for the Certainty and Infallibility of the Christian Faith.

They did so glory in the strength of this Argument, that the Jesuit-Preacher in *Limestreet*, read their Paper, and made the same Challenge in his Pulpit, where he had a great number of Protestants that went out of Curiosity to hear him.

Having thus (as I presume) vindicated our Author, and shewn

the Mischiefs of Mr. *Edw's* Fundamentals, I may now take my leave of my Reader. Only I am first willing to let Mr. *Edw.* know, that I have not undertaken this Defence out of any ambitious Humour of contending with so Learned a Man as he is; nor would I have made opposition to him in any other Point of Learning or Divinity: but Fundamentals every Man is concern'd in, and ought to know, and to be assured that he holds them all. *Eternal Salvation* is a greater thing by far than any Empire, and will therefore justify and exact our utmost Care and Endeavour for the obtaining it. So that in these Considerations of Mr. *Edw's* Exceptions—I have done my Duty to my self; and that I have publish'd them, I am perswaded I have therein done a great Charity to my Neighbours, the Poor and Bulk of Mankind, for whose Salvation (I hope) I should not think it too much to lay down my Life, however Mr. *Edw.* speaks so scoffingly of them, even where their eternal Happiness or Misery is deeply concern'd.

T H E E N D.